

NATHAN ANTOINE,)
))
Plaintiff,)
))
v.) Civil No. **06-795-WDS**
))
WEXFORD MEDICAL SERVICES, et al.,)
))
Defendants.)

It is clear that many of plaintiff's discovery requests are objectionable. The court has previously sustained objections of other defendants to similar discovery requests. **See, Doc. 62.** Again, the court points out to plaintiff that this is a claim for deliberate indifference. Therefore, questions about defendants' salaries, personnel files, performance evaluations, claims by other prisoners, administrative regulations, treatment protocols, names of Wexford's corporate officers, amounts spent on outside specialists, and the like, are not relevant.

Plaintiff also takes issue with Feinerman's answer to his questions about the cost of a colonoscopy. Defendant answered that he does not know. Plaintiff insists that he does know. The court cannot order a defendant to give an answer that is satisfactory to plaintiff. If Dr. Feinerman's knowledge of the cost is relevant, and plaintiff has evidence to indicate that Dr. Feinerman does, in fact, know the cost, he can present same at trial.

Upon consideration and for good cause shown, plaintiff's Motions for Order Compelling Disclosure and Discovery (**Docs. 59 & 63**) are **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: July 23, 2008.

s/ Clifford J. Proud
CLIFFORD J. PROUD
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE